

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

During the Interview dated 26 October 2006, the examiner explained that our argument is not commensurate with the claimed invention to the extent that claims do not call for processing “only” the records to which the identifiers are assigned as applicants had argued in the Request for Reconsideration filed 14 October 2006. According to the examiner, processing all the items in the temporary queue reads on processing any selected items to which the identifiers are assigned since the selected items are processed when all the items are processed. Moreover, according to the examiner, if all the items in the queue have identifiers assigned, then processing all the items on the queue will read on processing only the selected records to which the identifiers are assigned.

Based on the examiner’s comments, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to clarify that some of the displayed records have identifiers and some do not to more clearly define over the applied references. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchings (USP 5,940,813) in view of Roddy (USP 6,678,880). Applicant submits that the above amendment overcomes this rejection because neither Hutchings nor Roddy would have taught assigning identifiers to some of records selected from the records displayed in a display list, as set forth in each of independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

Specifically, each of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 now calls for assigning identifiers to some of records selected from the records displayed in the displayed list in response to a user’s operation selecting a processing order for some of the displayed records. Thus, the displayed list includes the records to which the identifiers are assigned and the records to which the identifiers are not assigned.

In rejecting the claims, the examiner argues that Hutchings discloses executing processing according to the processing order (relying on the passage set forth in column 9, lines 10-29), but does not particularly disclose how the priority codes are changed. The examiner relies on Roddy for the proposition that displaying a list of objects and changing the priorities of the displayed list of objects would have been obvious. Even if the combination as urged by the

examiner were deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination still would not have taught the assigning aspect set forth in the independent claims.

As previously explained, Hutchings discloses a transaction mover 32 that reads mover queue records (containing information for determining the order in which the temporary queue files will be processed) and sorts the same based on the read information. Once the mover internally sorts these files, these files are processed based on the order of priority. Note that all the items in the temporary queue are processed. Moreover, any change made to the codes does not become effective until after the mover is started the next time. See column 9, lines 13-27. Applicant submits that even if Hutchings were to list records and assign priority codes to the listed records, Hutchings still would not have disclosed or taught assigning identifiers to some of records selected from the records displayed in a display list in response to the user's operation selecting the processing order for some of the displayed records, and processing the records that have assigned identifiers. Roddy merely discloses displaying a list of objects and changing priorities of the displayed list of objects, and would not have alleviated Hutchings' shortcomings identified above. Accordingly, applicant submits that the combination urged by the examiner would not have taught the invention set forth in claims 1-30.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

15 NOVEMBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)